

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. No claims have been canceled or amended. Claims 1-60 remain pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract for failing to conform to formal requirements. The Abstract has been amended to satisfy all formal requirements. Thus, Applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for containing an embedded hyperlink, and required that such hyperlink be removed. While Applicants would like to comply with this request, Applicants are in a quandary as to how to do this. The application was not filed in electronic form but rather in paper form. Thus, Applicants did nothing to embed a hyperlink or browser executable code into the application. Applicants merely included a web site address in the text of the application. It appears that it was software at the Patent Office that converted the web site address into a hyperlink. Since Applicants have no control over such software, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants do not have the ability to comply with the Examiner's requirement, and hence, request that this objection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-15, 21-35, and 41-55 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for this allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16-20, 36-40, and 56-60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Richard (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0073119). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 recites:

A method for processing an entity that defines a computer process, comprising: executing a particular action set forth in a particular portion of said entity; generating a result as a consequence of executing said particular action; and associating a set of history information with said result, said history information indicating that said particular portion of said entity gave rise to said result. (Emphasis added)

Claim 16 provides an advantageous method for processing an entity, which enables the entity to be easily debugged. According to claim 16, a particular action in a particular portion of an entity is executed, and this causes a result to be generated. A set of history information is then associated with the result. The history information provides an indication that the result was given rise to by the particular portion of the entity. Because the history information is associated with the result, and because the history information indicates that the particular portion of the entity gave rise to the result, it is possible to "backtrack" from the result to the particular portion of the entity. That is, starting from the result, it is possible to determine that it was the particular portion of the entity that gave rise to the result. This ability to "backtrack" from the result to the particular portion of the entity greatly facilitates debugging because it enables a user to quickly and easily pinpoint the portion of an entity that gave rise to an erroneous result.

Such a method is neither disclosed nor suggested by Richard. Instead, Richard discloses a method for enabling input data marked up in any of a plurality of markup formats to be converted to output data in any one of the plurality of markup formats. In

Richard, the input data is transformed into the output data by way of a transformation script. As part of the transformation, a log file may be generated. The log file contains error messages generated during the transformation, and also an indication of the final outcome of the transformation.

In rejecting claim 16, the Examiner made the following interpretations: (1) the transformation script of Richard is the entity recited in claim 16; (2) the output data (i.e. the converted data) of Richard is the result recited in claim 16; and (3) the log files of Richard are the history information recited in claim 16. Applicants respectfully submit that under such an interpretation, Richard clearly fails to disclose or suggest the method of claim 16.

Specifically, it should be noted that, unlike claim 16, Richard makes no association between the output data (the result) and the log files (the history information). If there is any association, it is between the log files and the transformation script, not between the log files and the output data. In Richard, there is nothing associated with the output data that would link a portion of the output data back to a portion of the transformation script that gave rise to that portion of the output data. Because Richard lacks this association, Richard cannot backtrack from a portion of the output data to a portion of the transformation script to determine what portion of the transformation script gave rise to that portion of the output data. Because Richard fails to disclose or suggest associating the output data (the result) with the log files (the history information), as recited in claim 16, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over Richard for at least this reason.

Applicants further submit that claims 17-20, which depend from claim 16 and which recite further advantageous aspects of the invention, are likewise patentable over Richard for at least the reasons given above in connection with claim 16.

Claims 36-40 are apparatus claims which are analogous to the method of claims 16-20. Applicants submit that claims 36-40 are patentable over Richard for at least the reasons given above in connection with claims 16-20.


Claims 56-60 are computer readable medium claims which are analogous to the method of claims 16-20. Applicants submit that claims 56-60 are patentable over Richard for at least the reasons given above in connection with claims 16-20.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are allowable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all pending claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 27, 2004

  
Bobby K. Truong  
Reg. No. 37,499

1600 Willow Street  
San Jose, California 95125-5106  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on July 27, 2004

by 